

REMARKS

Claims 1-12 are pending in the present Application.

Claim 1 has been amended to further recite that step a) is performed with the electroplating bath having the unknown amount of brightener and leveler. This is supported in the Specification at page 10, lines 19-21. Step 3 in claims 1, 5, and 9 has been amended to recite that the plating occurs for a time selected from that sufficient to measure initial plating energy and that sufficient to measure the change in energy output with time. Support for this is found in the Specification at page 18, line 10 to page 19, line 5. Step g) in claim 5 has also been amended to recite that it is performed on the bath having an unknown quantity of both brightener and leveler. Step a) in claim 9 has been amended to recite that the quantity of brightener in the baths is the same, which is supported at page 10, lines 23-24 of the Specification. Claim 9 has also been amended to recite that the leveler is a reaction products of an amine with an epoxide and that the quantity of leveler is determined without first determining a quantity of brightener. These are supported by the Specification at page 21, lines 7-9, and page 19, lines 18-19, respectively. No new matter is added with this Amendment.

Claims 1-12 have been rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to point out particularly and claim distinctly the subject matter which Applicants regard as their invention. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Applicants submit that the present amendments to claims 1, 5 and 9 render this rejection moot. Further, Applicants submit that the term "condition of steady state" in claim 5 is clear to those skilled in the art, particularly in view of the Specification at page 13, lines 11-17. It is clear from the Specification that it is the potential or voltammetric cycle that reaches a steady state. Additional support for this being an art-accepted term can be found in U.S. Patent No. 4,132,605 at column 5, lines 32-37 and in U.S. Patent No. 6,551,479 at column 3, line 64 to column 4, line 1. Both of these patents are already before the Examiner. Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 9-12 have been rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sonnenberg et al. (U.S. 5,223,118) in view of Graham et al. (U.S. 6,551,479). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Applicants' invention provides a method of determining the quantity of leveler in an electroplating bath. Such quantity of leveler may be determined without the use of CVS or CPVS to first determine the quantity of brightener. This method is useful for determining the amount of a leveler when the leveler is a reaction product of an amine with an epoxide.

Nothing in Sonnenberg teaches or suggests a method for determining an amount of a leveler without first determining an amount of brightener. In fact, Sonnenberg is quite clear that the amount of both brightener and leveler is determined in one procedure. See column 3, lines 57-58. Such procedure requires the determination of the amount of brightener, see column 3, lines 66-68, and then determination for the ratio of brightener to leveler, see column 4, lines 8-10. Further, the only levelers disclosed in Sonnenberg are sulfur-containing, see column 6, lines 15-19. Accordingly, levelers that are reaction products of amines with epoxides are neither taught nor suggested in this patent. Thus, nothing in this patent teaches or suggests that the quantity of a leveler that is a reaction product of an amine with an epoxide can be determined without first determining the quantity of brightener.

Graham et al. has been cited for disclosing the step of stripping the electrode. Nothing in Graham fills the deficiencies of Sonnenberg.

Applicants submit that there is nothing in these patents alone, or in combination, that teaches or suggests the presently claimed invention. Applicants submit that the Examiner has not made out a prima facie case of obviousness and respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Applicants courteously request favorable consideration in the form of a notice of allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "S. Matthew Cairns".

S. Matthew Cairns, Ph.D.
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 42,378

EDWARDS & ANGELL LLP
PO Box 55874
Boston, MA 02205
Date: